

Bill Storm

From: Jerome Sand [jksandjr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2004 9:48 PM
To: Bill.Storm@state.mn.us
Cc: james.r.albers@excelenergy.com
Subject: Blue Lake Generating Plant Expansion Project Gas Pipeline Route

On Monday evening, May 10, 2004, I accompanied my Father, Jerome Sand, to the public meeting conducted by the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board and Excel Energy, to address the gas pipeline route selection and permit process for the Blue Lake Generating Plant Expansion Project.

My Father, along with my Mother, Bernice, own land, which fronts both the East and West borders along Zumbro Ave. Their address is 14025 Zumbro Ave., Shakopee, MN.

One of the concepts discussed at this meeting was the agreement by you and Excel, to review the possibility of an alternate pipeline route other than Zumbro Ave. The alternate to Zumbro Ave., which was discussed, was Highway 169.

We were informed at this meeting that the reason Zumbro Ave. was originally selected versus alternate route/s to its East, was because of development and density already happening East.

The concern for the Zumbro Ave. location selection is also one of future development and growth implications.

While easements along the Highway 169 alternative route would still be necessary, they would occur in an area already familiar with major highway right of way and other public uses.

We therefore strongly encourage the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board and Excel Energy to seriously reconsider Highway 169 as a viable alternate route to Zumbro Ave.

Should, however, the Environmental Board and Excel continue with the Zumbro Ave. route, it is very important that the appraisal and compensation process, for the permanent easement areas in question, take into consideration the value of the property, not only as it exists today, but with its future opportunity value in mind.

As stated earlier, the reason a route further East was not selected was because of development and density already being incurred. It is now only a very short time frame into the future, before this growth moves only slightly further West (Zumbro Ave.) It is therefore both reasonable and appropriate, that consideration for the permanent easements along Zumbro Ave should recognize this economic impact.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments and concerns. We hope you will give them strong consideration.

Jerry Sand
On behalf of Jerome and Bernice Sand
14025 Zumbro Ave.
Shakopee, MN 55379

5/12/2004

Bill Storm

From: Daryl Lee [dplee@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2004 8:35 PM
To: Bill.Storm@state.mn.us
Cc: kkandles@hotmail.com
Subject: In regards to natural gas pipe line for the Blue Lake Power Plant in Shakopee

Dear Mr. Storm:

I have several Red Cedar trees, one Norway Pine, two apple trees and some Maple trees in the area where the pipe line is proposed to go. Can you please call me at (952)445-0326 to set up a day when someone can come out here and see what can be done about this. I am off work next Monday and Tuesday, May 17 and 18.

I can also be reached through my wife's e-mail address which is kkandles@hotmail.com.

you,

Thank

Karen Lee

Daryl &

Express yourself with the new version of MSN Messenger! Download today - it's FREE! <http://messenger.msn.com/go/onm00200471ave/direct/01/>

Mike and Pat Huber
12956 Koeper Avenue, Shakopee, MN 55379
952-445-5245

5/12/04

Bill Storm, Environmental Quality Board
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Mr. Storm,

As the homeowners of 12956 Koeper Avenue, Shakopee, we are writing to voice our concerns on the proposed Xcel Energy pipeline going through Jackson Township. Our property is located at the corner of 130th (Co. Road 78) and Koeper Avenue (Co. Road 77). The legal description is Lot 3, Block 1, Kubes 1st Addition, Scott County, MN. As a corner lot the current placement has the pipeline on both road sides of our property.

Safety is one of our concerns of having a pipeline of this size and under this large amount of pressure so close to our home. We are also concerned about the fact that it will be making a 90 degree turn at our corner, or a smaller but two angled turn that would require even more easement.

The easement of 30 feet, five feet for the pipe and an additional 25 feet, would disrupt trees on our property as well as the adjacent properties that the pipeline will be traveling through. We would be losing over 18 apple trees, seven pine trees and nine broadleaf trees that we have watched grow, some from seedlings. Our neighbors have even more trees that would be lost. We are also concerned about the proximity of the pipeline to our septic drain field. There aren't a lot of places on the property that a drain field could be relocated. There is one other property owner with a drain field that would be close if not into the easement.

The alternate placement of the pipeline through the farm fields north of County Road 78 straight from Zumbro to the power lines along 169, seems to be a much more reasonable solution. The Jackson Township board recommended that Xcel Energy look into that route when they met with representatives from Xcel in April. It would not disrupt any current homes and it would allow for development around the pipeline instead of upsetting current homeowners. It also would seem that there would be less angles, less disruption for traffic in the area (fewer roads to go under) and be easier for the construction company.

From the meetings that we attended, it is our understanding that the reason for the current layout of the pipeline location was on a recommendation by the City of Shakopee. It doesn't seem that the undeveloped land, that is not presently located in the City of Shakopee, should have any precedent over the existing homes. When the City annexes that portion the developer would have the existing information and be able to plan the development around any existing pipelines. We don't have that option, our homes, trees, driveways, septic systems are all in place.

The idea brought up at the May 10 meeting of the pipeline going further west and following the current 169 corridor should be looked at to see how many homes that would disrupt or if it would be feasible.

We are aware of how hard siting a pipeline must be. No one wants it in their yard and yet we all need power. We do feel there are alternatives to the current proposed route that make much more sense and affect far fewer people. We would appreciate your looking at the other route options and changing the direction that the pipeline will be taking through Jackson Township. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mike and Pat Huber

Bill Storm

From: Perrytoothfairy@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2004 9:41 AM
To: Bill.Storm@state.mn.us
Subject: Blue Lake Pipeline alternate route-go North at junction Zumbro & 78.

Mr. Strom,

We would like you to consider our feed back on the Excel meeting headed by James Alders regarding the Blue Lake Generating Plant.

We believe the most sensible route is to continue straight North from the junction of Zumbro & 78. This makes sense as a viable alternate route because:

1. Mr. Alders shared with us that either route is workable for Excel.
2. It is the same distance as the presently proposed plan.
3. It would be a straight line.
4. Going North is open farm land. There are not homes that would be violated, intruded upon. Future development can plan accordingly, after your lines have gone through.
5. Mr. Alders told us that there are people out there that don't mind living next to a gas line. Going North will give potential new home owners a choice. You are not giving us a choice. We have been here long before your plan. We've made our lifetime investment in our homes and trees.
6. If you would check with the Scott County Soil and Water Conservation, you would see the 1,000's of trees that have been planted over the years that you will destroy with the current proposed plan going through 78 and 77.
7. The city of Shakopee as nothing to do with the open farm land we are referring to. Currently, it is Jackson Township, and that is who we are. If that land becomes annexed, future development can plan accordingly by the city at that time.

Please, please, please seriously consider your plan to continue straight North at the junction of Zumbro and 78. We will anxiously await a meeting to further discuss this. From what we understand, Mr. Alders is working on setting this meeting up.

We own land on both sides of 77 and are very concerned.

Respectfully,

Alan and Mary Beth Perry
490 West 128th Street
Shakopee, Mn. 55379
Phone 952-496-2838

5/13/2004

May 18, 2004

Mr. Bill Storm
Environmental Quality Board
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Mr. Storm,

We are writing to express our concern on the proposed Xcel Energy pipeline going through Jackson Township. Our property is located at the corner of Koeper Avenue (Co. Road 77) and 128th Street.

The proposed pipeline would literally wipe out our berm consisting of hundreds of trees and shrubs. That berm allows us privacy and noise control and with the growth in this area, that road will become increasingly busier. The easement that Xcel is requesting would encroach on our present drain field site for our septic system, and therefore, we would not be able to relocate our berm.

Safety is another concern in having a pipeline of this size so close to our house. We feel this would add anxiety to our everyday life. We never would have bought property adjacent to a line similar to this.

We are concerned about the devaluation of our property.

The preferred route would run straight north from the junction of County Road 78 and Zumbro Avenue until Highway 169, where it would join up with Xcel's existing powerline easement. This route seems to be a much more reasonable solution. It would require half as much easement acquisition from property owners and it would not disrupt any current homes.

In previous meetings with Xcel representatives, they led us to believe that the City of Shakopee was in favor of their proposed route. In conversations with the City Mayor, John Schmitt, and the City Planner, Mike Leek, we found out that was not the case. In fact, they both agreed that the alternate route makes the most sense. The alternate route would allow for development around the pipeline.

We understand the need for running such a pipeline, but under the circumstances the alternate route just seems to make much more sense for residents and Xcel. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joe & Diane Worm
531 W. 128th Street
Shakopee, MN 55379
(952) 445-7047

Bill Storm

From: LYNN LINK [dlmlink@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2004 7:51 PM
To: Bill.Storm@state.mn.us
Subject: Xcel's Proposed 16", High Pressure, gas pipeline

This is in response to Xcel's proposed 16", high pressure, gas pipeline.

We are residents along the proposed route, we are located at 611 W 128th Street, the back of our property runs up to 130th St/Cty Rd 78.

We agree with the Townships proposal to change the route of the gas line to run straight north from the junction of County Road 78 and Zumbro Ave. until U.S. Highway 169. The route would then continue along the south side of Highway 169.

The reasons to change the route are:

1. It affects 9 or more residents that are opposed, the Townships preferred route affects no such residences.
2. With Xcel's proposed route there will be significant property damage which will affect the 9 or more residents.
3. Some examples of significant damage would be the loss of established, valuable trees which provide privacy from the road. These trees cannot be replanted on the easement, this would also cause the loss of full use of the property.
4. Loss of usable property in which residents would still be liable for the property taxes.
5. The easement runs into some septic systems in our neighborhood.
6. The interruption of utilities while the line is being constructed. Example; electricity, telephone and gas.
7. The inconvenience to residents while their driveways and property are torn up.
8. The existence of such a utility on the property will decrease the value of the property and possibly deter many buyers from considering purchasing the property. It is unreasonable to believe that these property owners will be adequately compensated for the devaluation of their property.
9. One of the main reasons for the proposed route, according to Xcel Energy, is based on input from the city of Shakopee. The property affected is in Jackson Township, not within the city of Shakopee. The Township and its residents should be the decision makers in this area, not the city.

A **significant** concern is for the quality of our property, privacy, and lives with this change.

Fifteen years ago when we bought our property we knew 130th street/Cty Rd 78 would be going through our back yard. We planned accordingly for this inconvenience, so we bought and planted a significant amount of trees to some day provide privacy from the road. Over the years we have spent hundreds and hundreds of hours of hard work caring for and nurturing these trees. In the past three years we have been greatly rewarded for our effort and hard work because we now have the privacy we desire.

If Xcel chooses their proposed route we will lose a minimum of thirty feet of our **largest** trees which provide us the **most** privacy from the road. This thirty feet cannot be re-planted and therefore our privacy can never be replaced or compensated for adequately. No amount of

money can compensate us for the loss of trees and privacy we will incur. This is something that could not have been planned for fifteen years ago!

Considering there is a better alternate route we see no reason why Xcel cannot change the route. We hope you understand why we are against this route, not the pipeline and purpose of Xcel's gas pipeline. We hope that you will take into consideration the Township and the neighborhood's preferred route.

Thank you for taking the time to read our letter.

Sincerely,
Dave and Lynn Link

5/19/2004

The below signed residents of Jackson Township strongly oppose the proposed route of the Xcel gas pipeline. During two separate meetings with representatives of Xcel, residents have made a suggestion for a preferred alternate route.

The following is a description of the route change suggested by the residents.

Xcel proposed route:

The Xcel proposed route would run along the north side of County Road 78 from it's junction with Zumbro Ave. to the junction with County Road 77 and then along the west side of County Road 77 north to U.S. Highway 169.

Preferred route:

The route preferred by residents and the Jackson Township Board would run straight north from the junction of County Road 78 and Zumbro Ave. until U.S. Highway 169. The route would then continue along the south side of Highway 169.

Reasons to change the route:

1. The proposed route affects 9 established residences where as the preferred route affects no such residences.
2. The cost of the project should be less with the township's preferred route. There will be less property damage and there will be more room for construction activities.
3. If in the future, there is development along the preferred route, the development can be planned around the existence of the line. The residents along the proposed route do not have an option to redevelop. In two instances, property owners may lose their private septic systems.
4. Having a 16", high pressure, gas pipeline in the front or side yard of a residence will surely impact the value of the property. The existence of such a utility on the property will deter many buyers from considering purchasing the property. It is unreasonable to believe that these property owners will be adequately compensated for the devaluation of their property.
5. Many of the residents affected by the proposed route have spent many years establishing trees to provide a desired degree of privacy. Any of these trees that exist within the proposed easement will be removed and cannot be replanted. Again it is difficult to believe that these property owners will be justly compensated.
6. One of the main reasons for choosing the proposed route, according to Xcel Energy, is based on input from the city of Shakopee. The property affected is in Jackson Township, not within the city of Shakopee. The Township and it's residents should be the decision makers in this area, not the city.

1. ~~ROZ HALL~~
2. Patricia and Michael Huber
3. Diane and Joseph J. Worr
4. Alan and MaryBeth Perry
5. Dawn + Patrick Nashing
6. David & Pam Rannarain
7. Paul & Lynn Fink
8. Charles & Doreen Menecher
9. Hank & Fern
10. Gerald Marech
11. Theresa Reiss & Keith Spurr
12. _____